

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Moshe EIN-GAL
Appl. No. : 10/620,553
Filed : July 17, 2003
Title : SHOCKWAVE GENERATING SYSTEM
Group Art Unit: 3737
Examiner : Amanda L. Lauritzen
Docket No. : 1307EIN-US

Honorable Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REMARKS TO FINAL REJECTION

Sir:

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action mailed on September 22, 2006. This response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 20-25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al and Reichenberger.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al and Ein-Gal.

The above rejections are respectfully traversed and deemed improper. Claim 20 recites “a first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source device in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium; [and] a second membrane that covers an end face of said reflector.”

Examiner relies on the combination of Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al in all of the rejections. However, Hassler et al has only one membrane that covers an end face of the reflector (please see accompanying drawing) and Gruenewald et al, too, has only one membrane that covers an end face of the reflector (please see accompanying drawing). Thus, the combination of Hassler et al in view of Gruenewald et al does not teach the structure recited in claim 20 (“first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source

device in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium”).

In addition, Examiner rejects claim 21 because the “spatial adjacency of the sources suggests the second device sealingly passes through the membrane of the first device”. It is respectfully pointed out that perhaps the spatial adjacency of the sources suggests the second device sealingly passes through the *sealing ring*, but the second device in no way passes through the *membrane* (please see accompanying drawing).

Claims 20-28 are accordingly respectfully deemed patentable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DEKEL PATENT LTD.

BY David Klein

David Klein, Patent Agent
Reg. No. 41,118
Tel 972-8-949-5334
Fax 972-949-5323

E-mail: dekelltd@netvision.net.il



FIG. 1




FIG. 2

Perhaps a
"sealing ring"




FIG. 3

